



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,573	02/16/2001	Richard F. Creeth	03270- P0001A	4253
24126	7590	02/01/2005	EXAMINER	
ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC			CHEN, CHONGSHAN	
986 BEDFORD STREET			ART UNIT	
STAMFORD, CT 06905-5619			PAPER NUMBER	
			2162	
DATE MAILED: 02/01/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/785,573

Applicant(s)

CREETH, RICHARD F.

Examiner

Chongshan Chen

Art Unit

2162

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-43

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

As per applicant's arguments regarding Arning does not teach at least one cube object comprising at least one saved view of data; and at least one dimension object defining relationships between data in the at least one cube object have been considered but are not persuasive. First of all, the examiner interprets the phrases "at least one dataserer", "at least one cube object", "at least one saved view of data" and "at least one dimension object" as "one dataserer", "one cube object", "one save view of data" and "one dimension object". Also, applicant should note that the rejected claims recite the cube object and the dimension object are stored on dataserer, not database. Arning teaches a dataserer (Arning, Fig. 1, server 120) includes multi-dimensional databases 134, 136, a cube object (Arning, Fig. 3, page 4, [0058]-[0063], Logical Structure of Multi-dimensional Database, "Generally, the multi-dimensional database is arranged as a multi-dimensional array ... a three-dimensional array can be visualized as a cube with each dimension forming an edge") stored a dataserer (Arning, Fig. 1, server 120), and a dimension object defining relationships between data in the cube object (Arning, page 4, [0061], "cubes generally have hierarchies or formula-based relationships of data within each dimension ...") stored the dataserer (Arning, Fig. 1, server 120). Hence, the dataserer 120 of Arning has stored thereon both cube object and dimension object. Therefore, the arguments are not persuasive.

As per applicant's arguments regarding Arning does not teach the dimension object which define relationships between data in at least one cube object have been considered but are not persuasive. Arning discloses cubes generally have hierarchies or formula-based relationships of data within each dimension (Arning, page 4, [0061]). The cube object is the claimed dimension object because it defines relationships between data within each dimension of the cube. Applicant argues the cube objects do not define relationships between data in other objects. However, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "in other objects") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, applicant admits in the disclosure that store a cube object and a dimension object on a dataserer is known in the art (specification, page 8, lines 9-13, "Each Dataserer object 34 contains a collection of Cube objects 36 and Dimension Objects 38. The standard, high-level metadata objects are found in nearly all OLAP databases"). Therefore, the arguments are not persuasive.

As per applicant's arguments regarding Arning is concerned with solving a completely different problem than is the object model aspect of the present invention ... Claims 1 and 10 are directed to novel object model, the purpose and benefit of which is to provide a much more intuitive technique from a programming perspective as compared to employing low-level API function calls have been considered but are not persuasive. Arning and the claimed invention both relate to multi-dimensional databases. Both multi-dimensional databases have the same structure, they are used to store cube/dimension object. Although the goals of Arning and the claimed invention are different, it is noted that the goal is not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As per applicant's arguments regarding the references do not teach instantiates and inflates a predefined group of specified objects up-front a first time the database is accessed and instantiates and inflates nonspecified objects which are not included in the predefined group of specified objects on demand as each of the nonspecified objects is accessed have been considered but are not persuasive. Blackman discloses instantiates and inflates a predefined group of specified objects up-front a first time the database is accessed (Blackman, col. 6, lines 34-50, "the application program 106 dynamically loads previously-defined objects into the objects framework 108 to access the database 112 during execution time ... the application program 106 first loads the objects framework 108 class library by instantiating the DL/ITM object 200, one applView object 202, and one dbdView object 204"). Furthermore, Blackman discloses instantiates and inflates nonspecified objects which are not included in the predefined group of specified objects on demand as each of the nonspecified objects is accessed (Blackman, col. 5, lines 3-8, "the objects framework instantiates IMSTM data objects upon demand from application programs and manages those objects from creation to deletion. Furthermore, the objects framework uses these objects to dynamically construct DL/ITM calls from application program requests". Although, the application program instantiates the DL/ITM object 200, one or more applView object 202, and one or more dbdView object 204, one or more business objects (BOs) 206, one or more data objects (DOs) 208, and an Iterator object 210 in the first stage of the instantiation. These objects are just all type of objects the application program instantiates, but the application program might dynamically instantiates additional new data object (DO, the DO is one type of the objects instantiated in the first stage) upon demand, see Blackman, col. 8, line 65 - col. 9, line 5. The new DO object is dynamically instantiated only when the application program requests to create the new DO object. This is the second stage of on demand instantiation). Therefore, the arguments are not persuasive.